

No. 4324-3JJ-70/16011.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 492 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to appoint Shri Raj Kumar Hooda, temporary Assistant District Attorney, to be a Public Prosecutor for the District of Rohtak.

No. 4324-3JJ-70/16016.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (7) of section 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to appoint Shri D. S. Bali, temporary Assistant District Attorney, to be Government Pleader in the Civil District of Karnal and to authorise him to perform all/or any of the functions expressly imposed by the said Code on Government Pleaders except the functions specified in order XXVII rule 4 and order XXXIII w. f. rule 6 in the First Schedule thereto

No. 4324-3JJ-70/16017.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 492 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to appoint Shri D. S. Bali, temporary Assistant District Attorney, to be a Public Prosecutor for the District of Karnal.

No. 4324-3JJ-70/16020.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (7) of section 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to appoint Shri Sat Narain Goel, temporary Assistant District Attorney, to be Government Pleader in the Civil District of Hissar, and to authorise him to perform all/or any of the functions expressly imposed by the said Code on Government Pleaders except the functions specified in order XXVII rule 4 and order XXXIII rule 6 in the First Schedule thereto.

No. 4324-3JJ-70/16021.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 492 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to appoint Shri Sat Narain Goel, temporary Assistant District Attorney to be a Public Prosecutor for the District of Hissar.

M. L. BATRA, Secy.

HOME (POLICE) DEPARTMENT

The 18th May, 1970

No. 9150/B(H).—**Combination of posts.**—The Governor of Haryana was pleased to order that the additional charge of the office of the Dy. Inspector-General, Haryana Armed Police, would be held by Shri H.R.K. Talwar, IPS, Dy. Inspector-General of Police, Ambala Range, with headquarters at Ambala Cantt. Accordingly, he assumed the additional charge of this post on the afternoon of 15th January, 1970.

The 29th May, 1970

No. 9846/B-1. Leave.—The Governor of Haryana was pleased to grant 120 days earned leave with effect from 2nd January, 1970 (afternoon) to 2nd May, 1970 to Shri Joginder Singh, Offg. DSP A/43, under Rule 8.116 of Punjab Civil Service Rules, Volume I, Part I, as verified by the Accountant-General, Haryana,—*vide* his letter No. GAV/RT/Pol/12/1124-26, dated 10th February, 1970.

He would have continued to officiate as Deputy Superintendent of Police had he not proceeded on leave and the period of leave will count towards increment.

J. C. VACHHER,

Joint Secretary.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

The 19th May, 1970

No. 2666-ASOI-I-HB-II-70/12791.—In supersession of Haryana Government Notification No. 3570-ASOI-I-HBII-70/14131, dated the 20th June, 1968, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to constitute a Sanitary Board for the State of Haryana consisting of the following members :—

1. Minister for Health, Haryana	..	President
2. Minister Incharge of Development and Panchayat Departments	..	Member
3. Minister Incharge of Local Self Government Department	..	Do
4. Minister Incharge of P. W. D. (Public Health)	..	Do
5. Commissioner for Health and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Health Department		Do

6. Secretary to Government, Haryana, P.W.D. (Public Health Branch) ..	Member
7. Commissioner for Finance and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Finance Department ..	Do
8. Secretary to Government, Haryana, Development Department ..	Do
9. Commissioner for Local Self Government and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Local Government Department ..	Do
10. Chief Engineer, P.W.D. (Public Health), Haryana ..	Do
11. Chief Engineer, P.W.D. (Irrigation), Haryana ..	Do
12. Director of Panchayats, Haryana ..	Do
13. Director of Health Services, Haryana ..	Do
14. Director of Local Bodies, Haryana ..	Do
15. Technical Expert in Industrial Chemistry Industries Department, Haryana ..	Do
16. Deputy Director, Health Services, Haryana ..	Secretary

2. The functions of the Board as given in Haryana Government Notification No. 3570-ASO-I-HB-II-70/14/131, dated 20th June, 1968 will remain unchanged.

B. L. AHUJA.

Commissioner for Health and Secy.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

The 30th May, 1970

No. 657-B & C-70/14947.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to constitute a Committee consisting of the following to advise the State Government in securing financial assistance for Haryana State from the Government of India and to follow up cases in which such assistance has been sought :—

Chief Minister ..	Chairman
1. Finance Minister ..	Member
2. Public Works Minister ..	Do
3. Industries Minister ..	Do
4. Labour Minister ..	Do
5. Ch. Dalbir Singh, M.P., 56, South Avenue New Delhi-11 ..	Do
6. Shri Madho Ram Sharma, M.P., 71, North Avenue, New Delhi-11 ..	Do
7. Ch. Randhir Singh, M.P., 170, South Avenue, New Delhi-11 ..	Do
8. Shri Neki Ram, M.P., 55, South Avenue, New Delhi-11 ..	Do
9. Rao Gajraj Singh, M.P., 175, South Avenue, New Delhi-11 ..	Do
10. Shri D. D. Puri, M.P., Managing Director, The Saraswati Industrial Syndicate, Ltd., B-61, Greater Kailash, New Delhi-48 ..	Do
11. Ch. Sultan Singh, M.P., Rohtak ..	Do
12. Commissioner for Planning and Finances ..	Member-Secretary

The Ministers/Administrative Secretaries concerned will also be invited to attend the meeting of the Committee, when necessary.

2. The term of this Committee will be one year from the date of issue of this notification, but the Government may, by express order, extend the period or dissolve or reconstitute the Committee at an earlier date.

3. The Committee will meet periodically in the requirements of the transaction of its work and three members present will form the quorum of the meeting.

4. The headquarters of the Committee will be at Chandigarh.

5. The members of the Committee will draw travelling allowance and daily halting allowance as under :—

(i) The Travelling/Daily Allowance admissible to a Member of Parliament, will in respect of journeys performed by rail be the same as is admissible to the members of the State Legislature appointed in an *ex-officio* capacity less one Ist Class fare for journey by rail to and fro.

(ii) The Travelling Allowance for attending the meetings of the Committee will be allowed to the members from the permanent place of residence to the place of meeting. If however, the member attends a meeting from a place other than a place of his permanent residence T. A. will be allowed to him either from the place of his residence or from where he attends the meeting whichever is less.

(iii) The T. A. and D. A. will be admissible to non-official members on the production of a certificate to the effect that no T. A. in respect of the journey or D. A. for the period mentioned in the bill has been or will be claimed by him from any other official source.

(iv) The Chief Secretary to Government, Haryana, will be controlling Officer for countersigning the T. A. bills of non-official members.

6. The expenditure on account of T. A. etc. of the members of the Committee will be debitable to the budget grant under the head "19—General Administration—C—Secretariat and attached offices—(L) Civil Secretariat—Travelling Allowance".

ISHWAR CHANDRA,

Commissioner for Planning and Finance, and Secy.

PLANNING, FINANCE AND SMALL SAVING DEPARTMENT

The 28th May, 1970

No. 1467-ISS-70/881-A.—Shri Rajinder Singh, M. L. A., on his appointment as Minister, has resigned from the membership of the National Savings State Advisory Board, Haryana, constituted,—*vide* Haryana Government notification No. 5157-ISS-69/2541, dated 15th October, 1959, with effect from the 8th April, 1970.

ISHWAR CHANDRA,

Commissioner for Planning and Finance and Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 25th May/4th June, 1970

No. 4646-I Lab-70/16052.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of Messrs Auto Supply Co., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 72 of 1969

between

SHRI NEBHA RAM, WORKMAN, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS AUTO SUPPLY CO.,
FARIDABAD

Present—

Shri Darshan Singh, for the workman.

Shri D.C. Bhardwaj, for the management.

AWARD

Shri Nebha Ram was working as a Salesman in Messrs Auto Supply Co., Faridabad. His services were terminated and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. Accordingly the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred on him by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal, for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID/FD/454A/29819, dated 7th November, 1969:—

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Nebha Ram was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman and the management filed their written statement. On behalf of the workman it is pleaded that he has been working in the respondent concern for over 12 years and his services were terminated with effect from 13th March, 1969, on the pretext that he has become old and so he was of no use but no formal charge-sheet or show cause notice was given to him before terminating his services nor was he given any opportunity to show cause.

On behalf of the management it is pleaded that the workman was never refused employment and he voluntarily left the services of his own accord with effect from 13th March, 1969, without giving any reason whatsoever. It is pleaded that the workman is gainfully employed in a similar concern dealing with petrol and auto oils. It was pleaded that if the workman wanted to come back and work, the management had no objection to take him back into service. It is, however, stated that there were certain complaints against the workman with regard to misappropriation of funds and other property of the Company and the workman will have to explain if the complaints made against him were correct.

The only issue which arose from the pleadings of the parties was precisely the same as in the order of reference. The parties were, therefore, directed to produce evidence in support of their respective contentions. The management have produced their Manager Shri Kishori Lal in support of their case and the workman produced Shri Khem Chand, W.W.I, in rebuttal and he has also appeared in evidence as his own witness. I have carefully considered the evidence produced by the parties and in my opinion the version of the workman appears to be more probable. It is admitted on behalf of the management that the claimant Shri Nebha Ram has been working in the respondent factory from the last 12 years. The management wants this Tribunal to believe that the workman left the job of his own accord without any reason whatsoever. The claimant is an old workman of the respondent and there must have been some reason for him to leave the job. It is not stated that the workman was not satisfied with his emoluments or the conditions of his service. In para No. 3 of the written statement it is pleaded that the claimant is gainfully employed in a similar concern dealing with petrol and auto oils. The name of the company in which the claimant is supposed to be working after leaving the job of the respondent is not mentioned either in the written statement nor in the evidence of Shri Kishori Lal, Manager of the respondent concern. During the cross-examination of the claimant it was suggested to him that he had joined the service of Esso Petrol Pump. The claimant, however, denied the suggestion. In case the workman was really not interested in continuing in the service of the respondent concern and after leaving the service of the respondent took up a new job, it should not have been difficult for the respondent to lead some evidence to prove that the workman had really taken up another job somewhere else. The fact that no evidence has been produced to show that the workman has taken up a new job in another concern also gives a direct lie to the version of the respondent that the claimant left the services of his own accord and has taken up another job.

It appears that the management were not happy with the claimant Shri Nebha Ram. In para No. 4 of the written statement it is pleaded that the management never refused work to the claimant Shri Nebha Ram and they were still prepared to take him back provided he is prepared to explain his conduct in respect of certain charges regarding misappropriation of the funds and other property of the company. This means that the management do have a suspicion that the claimant is guilty of misappropriation of their property and there is no unconditional willingness to take the claimant back into service. The alleged offer to take the claimant back into service is hedged with the conditions that the claimant must first explain his conduct in respect of certain charges regarding misappropriation of funds etc. Shri Kishori Lal, M.W. I, Manager of the respondent concern has, stated in his evidence that a complaint, Ex. M.W. 1/1, was received against the claimant and an enquiry was made from him regarding this complaint but he did not give any explanation. I have gone through the complaint, Ex. M.W. 1/1 and it contains some serious allegations against the claimant. If the management wanted to satisfy themselves with regard to the correctness of this complaint, it was incumbent upon them to give a formal charge-sheet to the workman and ask for his written explanation and then hold an enquiry into the correctness of the charges contained in the complaint but this normal procedure was not followed. If the management did not want to go through the formalities of framing a formal charge-sheet and holding a regular enquiry against the claimant and they only asked him verbally to explain the allegations made in the complaint and the workman instead of giving any reply left the services of his own accord; the management could have given him a written notice informing him that instead of explaining his position with regard to the allegations contained in the complaint, Ex. M.W. 1/1, he had left the service of his own accord. The management also did not follow this obvious procedure but simply kept mum. Their allegation that the claimant has taken up a job elsewhere has not been proved. To my mind it appears to be very improbable that the claimant would give up a job which he was doing from the last 12 years without any reason whatsoever and then sit idle at home.

As we have already seen the version of the workman is that the management verbally told him to go away because he had been in their service for too long a period. Shri Khem Chand, W.W. I states that the management terminated the services of the claimant because they were not satisfied with his work. It is true that this witness was also previously in the service of the respondent and his services have been terminated. In cross-examination the witness was asked if there was a complaint of theft against him. The witness denied this suggestion. It is not possible to disbelieve the version of the witness simply because of a bald suggestion made against him that there was a complaint of theft against him and for this reason his evidence should not be relied upon. If there was any genuine complaint of theft against this witness and for this reason his evidence could not be relied upon the management could have at least produced a copy of the complaint made against the witness. Thus we find that the management have not been able to establish any of their allegations made against the claimant or his witness and therefore, it is not possible to place any reliance on their version that the workman without any reason whatsoever left the job which he was doing for more than 12 years. The workman in rebuttal has affirmed on oath that the management have terminated his services because from their point of view he had been in their service for too long a period. In my opinion the version of the workman appears to be correct and since it is proved that the management have terminated the services of the workman without giving him any charge-sheet or giving him any opportunity to show cause it must be held that the termination of his services was not justified and in order and he is entitled to be reinstated into service with full back wages and continuity of service. I give my award accordingly.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated 19th May, 1970

No. 882, dated 20th May, 1970.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated 19th May, 1970

No. 4648 I Lab-70-16934. —In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. R. B. B. D. Flour Mills, Ambala Cantt.

**BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD**

Application No. 221 of 1969 under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Between

Shri Malkhan Singh, workman, and the management of M/s R. B. B. D. Flour Mills, Ambala Cantt.

Present—

None, for the workmen.

Shri R. I. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

An industrial dispute was pending between the workmen and the management of M/s R. B. B. D. Flour Mills, Ambala Cantt, which was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal. During the pendency of reference the management is said to have terminated the services of their workman Shri Malkhan Singh, in contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Accordingly the aggrieved workman has filed the present complaint under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act and has prayed for reinstatement.

Notice of this application was given to the management. On behalf of the management it is submitted that the workman himself did not report for duty and therefore, he is deemed to have abandoned the service and, therefore, no question of any contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. On behalf of the workman it was stated that the workman gave an application for leave for 4 or 5 days in the last week of May, 1969, because he had some domestic work and when he reported for duty no work was given to him. Accordingly the following issue was framed:—

“Whether the workman was on leave for the period of his absence, if not, what is its effect?”

11th February, 1970 was fixed for the evidence of the parties but the evidence could not be recorded on the date fixed because of the illness of the Presiding Officer. The case was adjourned for evidence to 14th May, 1970. Notice of this date was given to both the parties and their service was effected. On the date fixed Shri R. L. Gupta was present on behalf of the management but no body appeared on behalf of the workman. The burden of proving that the workman was on sanctioned leave during the period of his absence was up on him but he has led no evidence to prove this fact. It can not therefore be held that the workman was on leave and the management were in any manner guilty of the contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947. I give my award accordingly. No order as to cost.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 18th May, 1970.

No. 880, dated 20th May, 1970.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated the 18th May, 1970.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 4647-ILab-70/16056.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Rohtas Saw Mills, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar.

**BEFORE SHRI P. N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

Reference No. 6 of 1969

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ROHTAS SAW MILLS, INDUSTRIAL AREA, YAMUNA NAGAR

Present :—

Shri Madhu Sudhan Saran Cowshish, for the workmen.

Nemo for the management.

AWARD

An industrial dispute having arisen between the workmen and the management of M/s Rohtas Saw Mills, Industrial Area, Yamuna Nagar and the same was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID/UMB/2-B/68/1757, dated 22nd January, 1969. The subject-matter of dispute referred for adjudication is as under :—

“Whether the action of the management in not providing the work to the following workmen during the period noted against each was justified and in order? If so, to what relief are they entitled ?

1. Shri Baldev Raj, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 28th August, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
2. Shri Lila Ram, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 28th August, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.

3. Shri Narinder Singh, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 6th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
4. Shri Jati Ram, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 29th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
5. Shri Allah Bandah, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 29th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
6. Shri Sadhu Ram, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 29th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
7. Shri Boota Ram, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 6th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
8. Shri Phool Chand, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 6th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
9. Shri Gian Chand, 1st September, 1968 to 4th September, 1968 and 29th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.
10. Shri Dewan Singh, 28th September, 1968 to 16th November, 1968.

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties. It is however not necessary to decide the case on merits because no body has appeared on behalf of the management and the representative of the workmen has stated that he does not wish to produce any evidence in support of his allegation and he wish to withdraw the reference because he had made an application claiming wages under the Payment of Wages Act. In view of the statement of the representative of the workmen I give no decision on the merit because neither party has cared to produce any evidence before this Tribunal.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated the 18th May, 1970.

No. 881, dated the 20th May, 1970

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 4649-I & Lab-70/16058.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Goel Industrial Corporation, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 63 of 1969

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S GOEL INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION,
FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Roshan Lal Sharma, for the workmen.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

The workmen of M/s Goel Industrial Corporation, Faridabad, served a general notice of demands on the management through the President of General Labour Union, Faridabad, asking the Dearness Allowance at the rate of 20%, profit bonus at the rate of 4 months wages per year for the years 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69. It was also demanded that the grades and scales of pay of the workmen should be revised. These demands were not accepted and the Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred on him by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act referred the following two demands for adjudication to this Tribunal,—*vide* Gazette notification No. ID/FD/231/C/28729, dated 23rd October, 1969:—

- (1) Whether the workmen of the factory are entitled to the grant of D.A.? If so, with what details and from which date?
- (2) Whether the grades and scales of the workmen should be fixed? If so, with what details and from which date?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workmen and the management filed their written statement. On behalf of the management a preliminary objection was raised that there was no industrial dispute because there was no meeting of the workmen wherein a resolution was passed by the workmen to prove that the demands which are subject-matter of the present reference were passed. The following preliminary issue was framed to dispose this objection:—

"Whether there is no industrial dispute"?

The management in order to prove that no industrial dispute in fact existed, made an application for summoning the President of the General Labour Union along with the Minute Books, Membership register, Membership form and subscription slip etc. The expenses of the witness was also deposited.

Shri Krishan Lal appeared on behalf of the union along with the relevant records. He was examined as a witness by the management. After referring to the membership register of the union he stated that 30 workmen of the respondent concern were members of the union. He also brought the membership forms and admitted that the name of the union was not mentioned on the membership forms. He further stated that the date on which the various workmen became members of the union was not mentioned on the membership forms and it was also not mentioned on the forms as to whether the workmen had in fact been accepted as members. The witness further stated that meeting of the workmen with regard to the present demands were held on 19th January, 1969, 16th March, 1969 and 13th April, 1969. He stated that in the meeting held on 13th April, 1969 only 10 workmen were present and that after 30th April, 1969 no workman has given any subscription to the union.

Shri A.K. Goel, Treasurer of the respondent concern also appeared as witness and stated after referring to the attendance register that on 13th April, 1969, 71 workmen were working in the respondent concern and that on 6th May, 1969 there were 78 workmen.

On behalf of the workmen no evidence was produced on the date fixed. Shri Krishan Lal made a request for time to produce evidence. On his request the case was adjourned to 6th February, 1970. No evidence could be recorded on 6th February, 1969 as the Presiding Officer was on leave and the case was adjourned to 1st April, 1970. On 1st April, 1970 also no evidence was produced on behalf of the workmen and an other opportunity was given to them and the case was adjourned to 1st May, 1970. On the date fixed no body even on behalf of the workmen although the court time was from 7.00 A.M. and I awaited for the workmen from 7.5 A.M. At about 11.00 A.M. the representative of the workmen appeared. He did not bring any evidence and a statement was recorded in which he requested for more time on the ground that the workmen were not available on the date fixed as he could not contact them. No explanation was given as to why the representative of the workmen could not contact the workmen and bring his evidence. Arguments were then heard and the cause was reserved for orders. Thereafter an application in writing has been received on behalf of the workmen in which it is alleged that the authorised representative of the union was busy on account of the strike in M/s Superseal India (P) Ltd., Faridabad and for this reason he could not appear in the Court in time on the date fixed. We have already seen that the representative of the workmen had appeared in Court at 11.00 A.M. At that time he did not explain that he was late because he was busy on account of strike in M/s Super Seal India Private, Limited, Faridabad. Moreover no reason was given as to why no evidence had been produced in spite of the various adjournments given for the purpose. The representative of the workmen has also not stated what evidence he wishes to produce in order to show that the demands have the support of a substantial number of workmen. As already pointed out the management summoned the record of the union itself in order to show that a substantial number of workmen of the respondent concern do not support the present demands and Shri Krishan Lal appeared in Court along with the necessary records of the union and gave his evidence. In case a substantial number of workmen had been really supported the present demand, the records of the union would have shown this fact. As we have already seen the records of the union does not show that the present demands are supported by a substantial number of workmen. It appears that the representative of the workmen is seeking adjournment again and again simply with a view to harass the management. Since it is proved by the evidence produced by the management that the present demands do not have the support of a substantial

number of workmen and the workmen have produced no evidence in rebuttal, I find this issue in favour of the management. The reference is held to be invalid on this ground. I give my award accordingly

Dated : 18th May, 1970.

P. N. THUKRAL,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 879, dated 20th May, 1970

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Dated , the 18th May, 1970.

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana ,
Fridabad.

B. L. AHUJA,
Commissioner for Labour and Employment and Secy.

राजस्व विभाग

मुद्रा बागीर

दिनांक 3 जून, 1970

क्रमांक 3731-II-70/12035.—श्री शिव लाल, सपुत्र श्री रामदत्त लाल, निवासी माल दजीरपुर, तहसील हजारी, जिला रोहतक की मृत्यु के परिणामस्वरूप हरियाणा के राज्यवाल पूर्वी पंजाब जागीर अधिनियम, 1948 के अवधि प्रदान की गई अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए सहर्व आदेश देते हैं कि श्री शिव लाल की मुद्रित 100 रुपए की जागीर, जो हिंडूपाटा पंजाब सरकार की अधिसूचना क्रमांक 213-टॉ सो 52863, दिनांक 14 अगस्त, 1952 द्वारा मंजूर की गई थी वह श्रीमती रामदेवी, वेश, श्री शिव लाल के नाम रखं। 1969 से मंजूर की जाती है। इन अधिकारों का प्रयोग यन्दि में नी गई शर्तों के अन्तर्गत किया जायेगा।

गुरुचरन सिंह बिल्हरा, अवधि सचिव।

DEVELOPMENT AND PANCHAYAT DEPARTMENT

The 1st June, 1970

No. 3353-2ECDI-70/12666.—Shri Mohinder Singh, Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Ferozepore Jhirka Block will hold the current charge of the Punhana Block in addition to his own duties till a regular Block Development and Panchayat Officer is posted there, with effect from the date, he takes over as such.

While holding the charge, the aforementioned officer will exercise the powers of Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Punhana Block.

No. 3485-2ECDI-70/12775.—The each of the following Social Education and Panchayat Officers will hold the current charge of the blocks noted against him in addition to his own duties till regular Block Development and Panchayat Officer is posted there, from the date noted against each :—

Serial No.	Name of Social Education and Panchayat Officer	Name of Block	Date of holding charge
1.	Fateh Singh	Kalayat	22nd May, 1970 (A.N.)
2.	Rughnath Singh	Sahlawas	19th May, 1970 (A.N.)

While holding the charge the abovementioned officers will exercise the powers of drawing and disbursing officers in respect of the blocks mentioned against their names.